



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## ➤CONTRIBUTED NOTES.◀

**Neubauer's Etymologies.**—It is a cause for regret that men of large scholarship and profound thought will, at times, lend themselves to the promulgation of ideas, built upon airy bases, the utter weakness of which their own knowledge should be the means of discovering. What applies to this class of men may also hold good when referring to those who employ Procrustean methods in the interpretation of the Bible, whether in a religious, historical, or geographical sense, to suit certain original views of their own—so original that, if advanced by the untutored, or the novice, they would excite derision.

I was recently perusing a short article by Dr. Adolph Neubauer, of Oxford, published in the *London Notes and Queries*, of January 29, 1887. Therein I found statements which (though I bow with respect to the man whose literary attainments have earned for him a deservedly wide reputation) forced a smile, that soon changed to a feeling not at all akin to humor. That so eminent a Hebraist should assert that "Jeremiah, as it is known, came over to Ireland, married an Irish princess, and brought over a copy of the Law, which is now buried in the Mount *Tara* (from *Thorah*, 'the Law')," must surely cause one's eyes to open in amazement. Who is the Irish historian that has made so important a discovery? And as for *Tara* having any meaning in common with *Thorah*, I would like to learn upon what authority Dr. Neubauer maintains it. Perhaps even stranger are other arguments aiming to prove an ancient settlement of Jews in the United Kingdom, as, for example, "Edinburgh" being derived from "Eden" (what about the termination?), "Eboracum" (or "York"), from "Eber" or "Ebrac" (can this be related to "Abrech"?), and "London" from "Lan-Dan," which Dr. Neubauer renders "the dwelling of Dan," but for which term, as a compound, he will find no support in the sacred text. The translation of "Lan," as "the dwelling," I am at a loss to understand, since "Lun" or "Lin" to *lodge* (or rather, to remain temporarily) does not convey the idea of permanence, as he attempts to show. Nor does the word "lan," occurring in Gen. XXXII. 22, have any other signification than that of "lodged."

But Dr. Neubauer ventures still further when he claims that "old London was, therefore, inhabited by the Danites (perhaps, a part of them went over to Denmark, although not yet claimed by the Danes)." What do students think of such an argument? Again, the Oxford Librarian writes, "the Guildhall may have been the lepers' house, connected with the Hebrew word גִּלְדָּה (Job xvi. 15);" and "in the name of Dublin is most likely to be found a reversed form, that name seeming to be *Dublan*, the dwelling of *Dub* or *Dob*. This word, which means, usually, in Hebrew, a bear, could, dialectically mean a wolf (hardened from *Zeeb*). The wolf represents the tribe of Benjamin (Gen. XLIX. 27), consequently a part of the Benjaminites settled in Dublin," etc. Apart from the point regarding the affinity of *Dob* and *Zeeb* (which may be possible, though it seems remote), what weight attaches to the main statements? In a more recent article, "The Anglo-Israel Mania," of Feb. 12th, he writes: "Not only from names of

towns can I prove the settlement of Israelitish tribes in the United Kingdom, but also from family names. So, for instance, would I suppose that the name of Labouchere is nothing else but Hebrew לַיִשָּׁר = Lavusar (in softened form) = the Prince of Levi. Will not this bring over to my 'craze' *Truth*, which has done me the honor of noticing my recent communication to 'N and I?'"

HENRY S. MORAIS,  
Philadelphia, Pa.

**Syriac and Assyrian.**—At the last meeting of the Oriental Society (see *Proceedings*, 1886, p. xxv) my friend, Professor Jastrow, of the University of Pennsylvania, opened up a new field of research for us in showing the affinities between Samaritan and Assyrian. If I put in a plea here for the Syriac, both as regards the Assyrian and the Samaritan, it is because, in these studies, this language has been unnecessarily neglected. Of all the Aramean dialects, the Syriac of Edessa ('Urhâi) and Nisibis (N'sîbhîn, Sôbhâ) is the one which has played the greatest part in history. Its vocabulary is therefore the most extended; and in studying Samaritan, our first recourse must of necessity be to the Syriac, to see whether a word is not of general Aramaic use. For instance, the stem ŠLM, as Professor Jastrow (p. xxvi) correctly shows, has the meaning "die" in Assyrian and Samaritan. The Syriac, however, has this meaning as well. Good old Castell (ed. Michaelis, p. 916) had already cited Mark xv. 37 [39]; 2 Macc. vii. 7, 13 (ed. Lagarde, p. 230). Trost adds Luke xxiii. 46. See also Wright, *Contrib. to Apoc. Lit. of N. T.*, 56:4, Šelmâth naphšê. The Syriac shows the same development, "complete, end," as the Assyrian. So also the Jewish Aramaic. Levy, TW., II., 487.<sup>1</sup> The Samaritan translation for Š'bhû'âthî, Gen. xxiv. 8, אִמִּי, is merely the Syriac îmi, îmâ, Payne Smith, col. 1602; Jewish Aramaic, יִמָּא, Levy, TW., II., 335. For the similarity of the verbs פִּי' and פִּי' see Nöldeke, *Mandaïsche Gram.*, § 179 (and note), ZDMG., XXII., 500. ŠLK *cut open, tear open* has the same meaning in B'khôrôth, 45a (Levy, TW., II., 490). For the Arabic see Lane, I., p. 1410 seq. As regards the MS. reading of Gen. xix. 29, see Kohn in ZDMG., XXXIX., 220. In the same manner the meaning "fight" does not attach to the stem KRB in Assyrian and Samaritan only. For the 'Aph'el in Syriac "bellavit" see the passages in Cast.-Mich., p. 825. "Contendere," with 'am, 'Aprêm, II., 32 E (cf. Ethiopic takarba *bellavit*). Likewise k'râbhâ (not kârbâ, as in Cast.) *bellum*; makr'bhânê *bellatores*, 'Aprêm, III., xxix; k'rabbhthânâ *bellicos*, Land, III., 211:12; Josephus, 15:5, etc. Jewish Aram. k'râbhâ, Levy, II., 385. Samaritan מִדְנַע comes from a form akin to the Syr. madhn'hâ: אֲדַלְלָא is the Syriac 'adh lâ.

For the derivation of אֲרִישׁ from ראשׁ, Professor Jastrow has the support of Castell in his *Heptaglott Lexicon*, p. 237, where he compares Samar. אֲרִישׁ with Heb. ראשית "per metath." For the Samar. talim and the Assy. talimu, see Smith's *Chaldäische Genesis*, trans. by Delitzsch, p. 272, n. 1. On תְּלִימוֹ = אֲחוּ, Gen. xli. 2, see Löw, *Aramaische Pflanzennamen*, p. 42, who cites Geiger, ZDMG., XVI., 732.

RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL,  
Columbia College.

<sup>1</sup> According to Wahrmund, *Handbuch der Arab. u. Deut. Sprache*, I., 920, the Arabic تسلّم arrives at a similar meaning in a different way: "du bist glücklich davon gekommen, d. h. der nach welchem du fragst ist gestorben."